

May 13, 2024

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**BY: lad
DEPUTY

HENRIK HAUSCHILDT)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

Cause No: 6:24-cv-00086-ADA-JCM

AGTEXAS FARM CREDIT SERVICES)

Defendant.)

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE TO THE COURT

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that HENRIK HAUSCHILDT, by and through, Henrik Hauschildt, states as follows:

All officers of the court for the United States District Court, for the Western District of Texas (Waco Division), are hereby placed on notice under authority of the *supremacy* and *equal protection clauses* of the United States Constitution and the common law authorities of *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, *Platsky v. C.I.A.* 953 F.2d. 25, and *Anastasoff v. United States*, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000) relying on *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U.S. 131, 135 (1992), *United States v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 517 U.S. 843, 856 (1996), quoting *Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 842 (1991) (Souter, J., concurring). *Trinsey v. Pagliaro*, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647, *American Red Cross v. Community Blood Center of the Ozarks*, 257 F.3d 859 (8th Cir. 07/25/2001).

In re Haines: pro se litigants (Plaintiff is a pro se litigant) are held to less stringent pleading standards than BAR registered attorneys. Regardless of the deficiencies in their pleadings, pro se litigants are entitled to the opportunity to submit evidence in support of their claims. *In re Platsky*: "court errs if court dismisses the pro se litigant (Plaintiff is a pro se

litigant) without instruction of how pleadings are deficient and how to repair pleadings.” *In re Anastasoff*: litigants’ constitutional rights are violated when courts depart from precedent where parties are similarly situated. All litigants have a constitutional right to have their claims adjudicated according to the rule of precedent. *See Anastasoff v. United States*, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000). Statements of counsel, in their briefs or their arguments are not sufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, *Trinsey v. Pagliaro*, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

May 13th, 2024

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

BY: /s/ Henrik Hauschildt
Henrik Hauschildt
Plaintiff, Pro Se
910 E FM 219
Hico, Texas 76457
dhdairy@gmail.com
Phone - (254) 459-0352
Fax - NA

Certificate of Service

Plaintiff certifies that on May 13th, 2024, the foregoing *Notice* was filed with the Clerk of this Court via ECF and all counsel of record.

/s/ Henrik Hauschildt

Distribution:

Stephanie E. Schwab
Attorney for Defendant AGTEXAS FARM CREDIT SERVICES
NAMAN, HOWELL, SMITH & LEE, PLLC
8310 Capital of Texas Highway North, Suite 490
Austin, Texas 78731
(512) 479-0300
FAX (512) 474-1901
sschwab@namanhowell.com